

REMARKS:

Examiner Nghi H. Ly is thanked for the courtesy of an interview extended to Applicants. The interview was held on April 12, 2005, at which Tadashi Horie, an attorney of record from Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione, personally appeared to meet with Examiner Ly.

In the interview, discussion focused on the patentability of claim 25 over the cited references, including Kuno et al. (US Patent No. 6,473,628). The differences between the claim 25 invention and Kuno et al. were explained. At the end of the interview, Examiner Ly indicated that Applicants' argument may overcome Kuno et al.

In the above amendment, Applicants have cancelled claims 70, 71 and 74-81. The subject matter recited in these cancelled claims will be submitted for further examination in a continuation application. Since cancellation of claims 70, 71 and 74-81 is the only amendment made in the above amendment, the amendment should not raise any new issue.

As discussed during the interview, Applicants would like to call the Examiner's attention to the following two limitations in claim 25:

a registration control that stores a selected one of the one or more blocks of received screen data in one of multiple memory areas each correlatable to any one of the at least one standby state;

a correlation control that dynamically correlates the one of the multiple memory areas to a selected one of the at least one standby state;

The registration control stores screen data in a memory area. Please note that each memory area is correlatable to any one of the at least one standby state and that the correlation control is called to dynamically correlate the memory area with a standby state. The functions of the registration control and the correlation control are exemplarily discussed in the specification. (paragraphs 100-102 and 106-111). Also, the specification states in paragraph 131 that it is possible to have multiple types of screen data so as to display different screen data at the user's choice.

On the other hand, in Kuno et al., an image stored in the ROM 13 is shown during the standby state. (col. 9, line 16-18). An image may be a single image such as

shown in Fig. 9. Multiple images such as shown in Fig. 11 may be stored in the ROM 13 and shown in a random sequence. (col. 9, lines 14-38).

Please note that there is nothing in Kuno et al. that discloses or teaches the correlatable memory areas and the dynamic correlation between the memory areas to the standby state of the present invention. In Kuno et al., the image data is prestored in a memory area in the ROM 13 which is fixedly linked to the standby state. In other words, correlation between the standby state and the memory area in the ROM 13 that has the image data is static, not dynamic. In Kuno et al., multiple images may be randomly shown during the standby state. But the memory area that has the multiple images is statically linked to the standby state. Thus, the user of Kuno et al. cannot link an image of his selection to the standby state.

The Examiner takes the position in the Office Action that Kuno et al. and Evans et al. (US Patent No. 6,650,889) combined teach the present invention. Evans et al. discloses that a local terminal downloads graphic data through the Internet and stores the data therein with tags. The basic browsing function calls for downloaded data to be stored in a temporary memory for the viewing purpose. Evans et al. further stores the downloaded data in a permanent memory. The next time the same graphic data is to be downloaded, only the tag is downloaded, with which the local terminal retrieves the graphic data stored in the permanent memory and displays it. Thereby, downloading time can be saved.

First of all, there is no motivation to combine Kuno et al. and Evans et al. In actuality, Kuno et al. teaches away from the combination with the Evans reference. Kuno et al. teaches that all the images are stored in the ROM and that the user of the terminal is confined within the prestored images and cannot add new images or replace the existing images with new images. In contrast to the teaching of Kuno et al., Evans et al. does not relate to screen images for a standby state. Rather, Evans et al. relates to downloading and storing image data to prevent redundant downloading, not to display the data for a standby state. For the purpose of the present invention, there is nothing common between Kuno et al. and Evans et al. No one could be motivated to combine them to teach the subject matter of the present invention.

Even if Kuno et al. and Evans et al. could be properly combined, the combination still fails to meet the invention as claimed. There is nothing in Kuno et al. and Evans et al., either alone or in combination, which discloses or teaches the correlatable memory areas and the dynamic correlation between the memory areas to the standby state. Therefore, Kuno et al. and Evans et al., even combined, could not go beyond the teaching of Kuno et al. Under the teaching of Kuno et al., the user cannot display an image of his selection for a standby state. The user is confined within the prestored images and cannot add new images or replace the existing images with new images.

The Examiner cites Thompson et al. in the Office Action. Thompson et al. is silent about the above features of the present invention.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 9, 2005



Tadashi Horie
Registration No. 40,437
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
(312) 321-4200